

Manufactured Homes (Residential Parks) Amendment Bill 2024

Submission No: 26
Submitted by: Lesley Parr
Publication:
Attachments: No attachment
Submitter Comments:

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Housing, Big Build and Manufacturing Committee](#)
Subject: Manufactured Homes Amendment Bill 2024 Public comment
Date: Tuesday, 9 April 2024 5:09:55 PM

My name is Lesley J Parr, my email address is [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

I live at [REDACTED] and have been here since November 2020.

I feel strongly that site fees increases should be limited to the increases in State pension payments or to 2% per year. We have a fixed income and can't work more hours to get extra income when site fees increase and 2% will allow us to budget and give us some peace of mind that we can afford to continue living here into the future.

Our resort owner Stockwell advertises to prospective investors that rents paid by residents are supported by rent subsidies paid by the State government so increasing site fees is not a problem. They are making so much profit that they promise very high rates of return on investment.

The housing model is grossly unfair to single people, they can't get the same amount of use out of facilities that a couple can, yet they still pay the same ground rent. Perhaps a \$50 per fortnight discount would be fair.

Transparency and accountability, (standard practice in Retirement villages) is totally absent from our resort owner. The owner takes our rent money and decides what to do with it, without any consultation with residents. We are told the resort is an extension of our home, yet if we ask about finances we are told that it is none of our business and resort owners are entitled to make a profit, (published in some prospectuses as high as 65%).

S71 should be deleted, it is grossly unfair. Money for improvements should be found from excessive profits. Currently we have no right to review finances of the Park Owner.

The dispute resolution process is far too long and involved. Resort owners just do nothing and stall progress. Older people often do not have the drive and determination to follow through or are fearful of retribution if they are too difficult. Owner's rely on this age factor to wear us down and simply get away with poor management and communication with residents.

QCAT is too slow and advantageous to Resort Owners, they just drag their heels and do nothing until the complaint has expired.

The buy back scheme is wrong, site fees should drop immediately by 25% upon death or urgent relocation into full time care, then by a further 50% if the house remains unsold after 6 months. Nobody is using park facilities after all. This approach gives the Park Owner a big incentive to assist with the sale.

Home Owners should always have a choice of selling agent, everyone else does, why can't we?

Disputed rent increases, especially from recent (soon to be defunct) market reviews should be put on hold. This encourages the Resort Owners to negotiate and DO something instead of just saying 'we're entitled to make a profit'.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require further information or explanation.

Regards

Lesley